

Applicants: EDLIS, Ofir et al.
Serial No.: 09/778,818

Attorney Docket No.: P-3309-US
Assignee: Intel Corporation

REMARKS

Applicants have carefully studied the Office Action. This paper is intended to be fully responsive to all points of rejection and objection raised by the Examiner and is believed to place the application in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and allowance of the application are respectfully requested.

Status of the Claims

Claims 1-8 and 10-19 are pending in this application. Applicants submit herewith a proposed Amendment to independent claims 1, 10 and 15, and respectfully request favorable reconsideration and entry of the proposed Amendment.

Finality of Action

Applicants acknowledge the fact that the outstanding Office Action was made Final and, therefore, the Examiner may not allow entry of substantive amendments to the claims, e.g., amendments that may require further searching, at this point, without accompanying such amendments with a Request for Continued Examination under 37 CFR 1.114. However, Applicants believe that upon reviewing the above proposed amendments and the following remarks, the Examiner will appreciate that the changes in the claims relate to subject matter already within the scope of the searches and discussions to date, and that entry of these proposed amendments will not require additional searches and will not impose any other burden on the Examiner to justify filing of a Request for Continued Examination.

Applicants respectfully request favorable reconsideration of the application and entry of the proposed amendments to independent claims 1, 10 and 15. However, if the Examiner believes that a Request for Continued Examination under 37 CFR 1.114 is warranted in this case, the Examiner is hereby requested to kindly respond to this proposed Amendment in a timely issued Advisory Action that will present the Applicants with an opportunity to file a Request for Continued Examination or a Notice of Appeal without incurring additional fees to obtain Extensions of Time.

Applicants: EDLIS, Ofir et al.
Serial No.: 09/778,818

Attorney Docket No.: P-3309-US
Assignee: Intel Corporation

Voluntary Amendment of Claims

Applicants propose to voluntarily amend independent claims 1, 10 and 15 to more clearly define what the Applicants regard as the invention. No new matter is added by this proposed Amendment.

Specifically, without conceding the appropriateness of any rejection or objection raised by the Examiner, Applicants propose to voluntarily amend each of independent claims 1, 10 and 15 to recite, in paraphrase, a radio frequency module able to receive through an antenna incoming wireless communication signals.

For purposes of clarity and simplicity, the discussion herein may refer to independent claims 1, 10 and 15, in their requested amended version, as amended claims 1, 10 and 15, respectively.

Applicants respectfully request favorable reconsideration and entry of the amendment to independent claims 1, 10 and 15.

Claim Rejections under 35 USC 102(e)

The Examiner rejected claims 1, 10 and 15 under 35 USC 102(e) as being anticipated by Tsern et al., United States Patent Number 6,263,448 ("Tsern").

As is well established, in order for a claim to be anticipated by the prior art, each and every element and feature of the claim must be included in a single prior art document.

Amended independent claim 1, recites, *inter alia*, "a radio frequency module receives through an antenna incoming wireless communication signals carrying data and stores said data". Tsern does not disclose, teach or suggest at least these features of amended independent claim 1.

Each of amended independent claims 10 and 15, recites, *inter alia*, "a radio frequency module adapted to receive through an antenna wireless communication signals". Tsern does not disclose, teach or suggest at least these features of amended independent claims 10 and 15.

Applicants would like to point out that Tsern describes a memory device with multiple clock domains, which are sequentially turned on as needed to limit the power consumed (Tsern, Abstract). Tsern does not disclose a radio frequency module able to receive through an antenna incoming wireless communication signals carrying data and to store said data.

The Examiner contended that “the clock receiver as disclosed in Tsern is interpreted to be RF in the context of a frequency useful for radio transmission in the practicable limits of 10 KHz and beyond”. Applicants respectfully disagree. Applicants respectfully submit that the clock receivers described in Tsern are not useful for receiving Radio Frequency transmission, or to receive through an antenna wireless communication signals carrying data. For example, the clock receiver 84 of Tsern clearly “receives” a wired input from a Delay Lock Loop (DLL) 86 (Tsern, FIG. 5). Similarly, the receiver 78 of Tsern clearly operates based on input from the wired control line 100 (Tsern, column 5, line 57) or from the CAS control logic 70 (Tsern, FIG. 5). The receiver 64 of Tsern similarly operates to connect between control logic 62 and control bus line 66 (Tsern, FIG. 5).

Accordingly, the “receivers” of Tsern are clearly clock receivers or control logic receivers, able at most to receive a wired clock signal or a wired control logic signal. Tsern does not fairly disclose that any of its “receivers” is a radio frequency module able to receive through an antenna incoming wireless communication signals carrying data, as recited in paraphrase in each of amended independent claims 1, 10 and 15.

Applicants further submit Tsern does not describe, teach or suggest that any of its “receivers” is able to store data carried by incoming wireless signals. The “receivers” of Tsern clearly operate as gates between control logic components along a pipeline, and are not able by themselves to “store” data.

In view of the above, it is respectfully asserted that Tsern does not anticipate any of amended independent claims 1, 10 and 15.

Applicants further submit that the above-mentioned features of claims 1, 10 and 15 would not have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having

Applicants: EDLIS, Ofir et al.
Serial No.: 09/778,818

Attorney Docket No.: P-3309-US
Assignee: Intel Corporation

ordinary skill in the art. Therefore, although the Examiner has not made such a rejection, Applicants respectfully submit that amended independent claims 1, 10 and 15 are patentable over Tsern and/or any other prior art references on record, and any combinations of those references, including United States Patent Number 6,453,181 to Challa et al. ("Challa"), United States Patent Number 6,584,313 to Butler ("Butler"), and/or United States Patent Number 6,608,858 to Sih ("Sih").

In view of the above, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claims 1, 10 and 15 under 35 USC 102(e) based on Tsern be withdrawn.

Claim Rejections Under 35 USC §103(a)

The Examiner rejected claims 3-8, 11, 13, 16 and 18 under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Tsern in view of Challa.

Without conceding the appropriateness of the combination, Applicants respectfully submit that the combination of Tsern and Challa does not meet the requirements of an obviousness rejection, in that the combination at least fails to teach or suggest all the elements of the claimed invention.

Amended independent claim 1, recites, *inter alia*, "a radio frequency module receives through an antenna incoming wireless communication signals carrying data and stores said data". Tsern does not disclose, teach or suggest at least these features of amended independent claim 1. Challa does not cure the deficiency of Tsern; accordingly, Tsern and/or Challa, alone or in combination, do not disclose, teach or suggest at least these features of amended independent claim 1. Therefore, Tsern and/or Challa, alone or in combination, do not render amended independent claim 1 obvious.

Each of amended independent claims 10 and 15, recites, *inter alia*, "a radio frequency module adapted to receive through an antenna wireless communication signals". Tsern does not disclose, teach or suggest at least these features of amended independent claims 10 and 15. Challa does not cure the deficiency of Tsern; accordingly, Tsern and/or Challa, alone or in combination, do not disclose, teach or suggest at least these features of

Applicants: EDLIS, Ofir et al.
Serial No.: 09/778,818

Attorney Docket No.: P-3309-US
Assignee: Intel Corporation

amended independent claims 10 and 15. Therefore, Tsern and/or Challa, alone or in combination, do not render amended independent claims 10 and 15 obvious.

Claims 3-8, claims 11 and 13, and claims 16 and 18, are dependent from amended independent claims 1, 10 and 15, respectively, and include all the features of the independent claims as well as additional distinguishing features. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that the novelty and patentability of claims 3-8, claims 11 and 13, and claims 16 and 18, follow directly from the novelty and patentability of amended independent claims 1, 10 and 15, respectively.

In view of the above, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claims 3-8, 11, 13, 16 and 18 under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Tsern in view of Challa be withdrawn.

The Examiner rejected claim 2 under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Tsern in view of Butler.

Without conceding the appropriateness of the combination, Applicants respectfully submit that the combination of Tsern and Butler does not meet the requirements of an obviousness rejection, in that the combination at least fails to teach or suggest all the elements of the claimed invention.

Claim 2 is dependent from amended independent claim 1, which recites, *inter alia*, "a radio frequency module receives through an antenna incoming wireless communication signals carrying data and stores said data". Tsern does not disclose, teach or suggest at least these features of amended independent claim 1. Butler does not cure the deficiency of Tsern; accordingly, Tsern and/or Butler, alone or in combination, do not disclose, teach or suggest at least these features of amended independent claim 1. Therefore, Tsern and/or Butler, alone or in combination, do not render amended independent claim 1 obvious.

Claim 2 is dependent from independent claim 1, and includes all the features of independent claim 1 as well as additional distinguishing features. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that the novelty and patentability of claim 2 follow directly from the novelty and patentability of independent claim 1.

Applicants: EDLIS, Ofir et al.
Serial No.: 09/778,818

Attorney Docket No.: P-3309-US
Assignee: Intel Corporation

In view of the above, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claim 2 under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Tsern in view of Butler be withdrawn.

The Examiner rejected claims 12 and 17 under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Tsern in view of Sih.

Without conceding the appropriateness of the combination, Applicants respectfully submit that the combination of Tsern and Sih does not meet the requirements of an obviousness rejection, in that the combination at least fails to teach or suggest all the elements of the claimed invention.

Claims 12 and 17 are dependent from independent claims 10 and 15, respectively. As discussed above, each of amended independent claims 10 and 15, recites, *inter alia*, "a radio frequency module adapted to receive through an antenna wireless communication signals". Tsern does not disclose, teach or suggest at least these features of amended independent claims 10 and 15. Sih does not cure the deficiency of Tsern; accordingly, Tsern and/or Sih, alone or in combination, do not disclose, teach or suggest at least these features of amended independent claims 10 and 15. Therefore, Tsern and/or Sih, alone or in combination, do not render amended independent claims 10 and 15 obvious.

Claims 12 and 17 are dependent from independent claims 10 and 15, respectively, and include all the features of these independent claims as well as additional distinguishing features. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that the novelty and patentability of claims 12 and 17 follow directly from the novelty and patentability of amended independent claims 10 and 15, respectively.

In view of the above, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claims 12 and 17 under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Tsern in view of Sih be withdrawn.

Applicants: EDLIS, Ofir et al.
Serial No.: 09/778,818

Attorney Docket No.: P-3309-US
Assignee: Intel Corporation


Conclusion

In view of the foregoing amendment and remarks, and upon entry of the proposed amendments to independent claims 1, 10 and 15, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 1-8 and 10-19 are deemed to be allowable. Their favorable reconsideration and allowance are respectfully requested.

Should the Examiner have any question or comment as to the form, content or entry of this paper, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number below. Similarly, if there are any further issues yet to be resolved to advance the prosecution of this application to issue, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned counsel.

No fees are believed to be due in connection with this paper. However, if any fees are in fact due in connection with this paper, please charge any such fees to deposit account No. 50-3355.

Respectfully submitted,



Naim Shichrur
Agent for Applicants
Registration No. 56,248

Dated: May 10, 2006

Pearl Cohen Zedek Latzer, LLP
1500 Broadway, 12th Floor
New York, New York 10036
Tel: (646) 878-0800
Fax: (646) 878-0801